

## **REMARKS**

The amendments shown above and these Remarks are made in reply to the Office Action mailed March 30, 2009. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-13 and 16-19 were examined and remain pending. Claims 1, 4-6 and 9-12 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **I. SUMMARY OF THE EXAMINER'S ACTIONS**

In the Office Action mailed March 30, 2009, the Examiner:

- rejected claims 1, 4-6 and 9-12 under § 101 as non-statutory; and
- indicated that claims 1, 4-6, 9-13 and 16-19 would be allowable if the Section 101 rejection is overcome.

### **II. SPECIFIC RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINER'S ACTIONS**

#### **A. The Section 101 Rejection is Overcome**

The Examiner rejected independent claim 1 and related dependent claims 4-5 as non-statutory. Applicant has amended claim 1 to change the recited terms "user Web service" and "content Web service" to "user Web server" and "content Web server" respectively, and to add the limitation that these Web servers communicate "over a network." Likewise, the recited terms "compiler Web service" in claim 4 and "evaluator Web service" in claim 5 have been changed to "compiler Web server" and "evaluator Web server" respectively. Applicant submits that claims 1, 4 and 5 as amended are statutory, and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 6 and related dependent claims 9-12 as non-statutory. Similarly, the term "Web service" in these claims has been replaced by the term "Web server." Therefore, applicant submits that claims 6 and 9-12 as amended are statutory, and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

B. Claims 13 and 16-19 Are Allowable

Although the Office Action Summary indicates that claims 13 and 16-19 are rejected, the Examiner has not described any basis for the rejection in the Action, and in the absence of such basis, applicant believes that these claims are allowable.

**III. CONCLUSION**

Based on the remarks above, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 4-6, 9-13 and 16-19 is respectfully requested. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 30, 2009

By: /Richard A. Nebb/  
Richard A. Nebb  
Reg. No. 33,540

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DeNIRO LLP  
575 Market Street, Suite 2500  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: 415.369.9660  
Facsimile: 415.369.9665